REMARKS

Claims 1 and 4-7 remain pending in the present application. Claims 2 and 3 have been canceled. Claims 1, 4 and 5 have been amended. Claims 6 and 7 are new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ito, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,803,166). Ito discloses a vehicle air conditioner with front and rear conditioning means in which the front blowout condition is based upon a linear model (see Fig. 7) and the rear blowout condition is based upon a non-linear model (see Figs. 11 and 12). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 1 has been amended to define that the front air conditioning control means determines its blowout condition by means of a neural network and that the rear air conditioning control means determines its blowout condition by means of a linear model. These limitations are similar to the limitations of Claims 2 and 3, which have been canceled.

The Examiner characterized Itou as having the rear blowout condition based upon a non-linear model shown in Figures 11 and 12. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this interpretation of Itou. Applicant believes Figures 11 and 12 of Itou teach a linear model not a non-linear model. The mathematical definition of linear is "consisting of, involving or described by terms of the first degree" (Jess Stein: "The Random House Dictionary of the English Dictionary", Random House). Itou discloses how to determine

the timing to stop the fan of the rear air conditioner to prevent the rear air conditioner from blowing out cool air during rapid heating.

The non-linear, neural network, mode of the present invention defined in Claim 1 will be significantly more complex than Itou. It will not be composed of straight lines but will be composed of a set of one-to-one transformations, etc. which are made based on the training data.

Ichishi discloses the use of a neural network system for air conditioning of a vehicle but there is no incentive to combine Ichishi, which is a high cost and mechanically complicated system, with Itou in order to simply control the timing to stop the fan. Ichishi does not disclose, teach or suggest the issue of cost and mechanical complexity in using the neural network system nor does it mention how to decrease the cost and complexity when using the neural network. The present invention reduces the cost and complexity of using the neural network system for only the front while using the low cost linear system for the rear. This combination is not disclosed, taught or suggested by the combination of Itou and Ichishi.

Thus, Applicant believes Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito, et al. Ito, et al. discloses a vehicle in which the rear seat has two rows of seats. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito, et al. as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Ichishi, et al. (U.S. Pat. No.

6,220,517). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito, et al. as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Japanese reference 8-230444. Claims 4 and 5 have been amended to depend from Claim 1. As stated above, Claim 1 has been amended and is now believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Thus, Claims 4 and 5 are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Claims 2 and 3 have been canceled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

New Claims 6 and 7 ultimately depend from Claim 1 and are believed to properly further limit Claim 1.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: <u>December 7, 2004</u>

By: _____
Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg